REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are currently active.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6 as being unpatentable over Roger in view of Matyas. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In chapter 2, section 2.1 beginning on page 9, Roger teaches that the Speaker may have control to several different dimensions over dissemination of information about his own speech. The Speaker controls the ability of readers to leak his utterances. The Speaker controls what the readers can reply to his utterances. The speaker controls how much partial information about himself is leaked based on the content of his speech. The speaker controls how much personal information is leaked based on the communications channel he chooses to use. The Speaker controls how long the speech persists after the publication. The Speaker controls which other parties will be able to read his speech. What is key in regard to these teachings is that the Speaker is the party that is controlling what all the readers can do. This is key to the overall fundamental intent and design of the system taught by Roger. In contrast, applicants' claimed invention does not have the speaker have the control over the digital signals. Once the host computing device provides the public key to a first of the two user computing devices, the first user (and not the host computing device) then has the control over

who to send the public key on to in regard to the second user computing device. This is fundamentally distinct from the teachings of Roger and how Roger controls the publication.

The Examiner suggests that the teaching of Matyas which teaches a peer-to-peer key distribution method in combination with Roger arrives at applicants' claimed invention. However, it is respectfully submitted to the Examiner that it is black letter law that teachings must be taken in the context in which they are found. The two contexts of Roger and Matyas are totally distinct and taking the teaching of Matyas and trying to apply it to Roger will totally change the intent and purpose of Roger. Moreover, Roger would never consider such a peer-to-peer key distribution technique, as claimed by applicants because it goes against the very heart of the speaker controlling his publication. For this reason alone, Claim 1 is patentable over Roger in view of Matyas since the context of the two references is totally distinct.

Furthermore, there must be some teaching in the references themselves to combine the teachings the Examiner is suggesting to combine, to arrive at applicants' claimed invention. Here, there is no such teaching in the references themselves.

It is further respectfully submitted that the Examiner is using the hindsight from applicants' own claim to combine the references to arrive at applicants' claimed invention. The Examiner is using the limitations of Claim 1 as a road map to find the different limitations of the claim in the different references, and having found them, concludes that applicants'

claimed invention is arrived at. This is not patent law. Ninety-nine percent of all inventions are combinations of known elements. Applicants do not suggest they discovered Public Key, but applicants are of the position that their claimed invention is the first to use a public key in the specific manner where the first user computing device sends a public key to a second of the two user computing devices through the communication means to establish the decentralized trusted network, as found in Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is patentable over the applied art of record.

Claim 2 is patentable for the reasons Claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 3-6 are dependent to parent Claim 2 and are patentable for reasons Claim 2 is patentable.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3 as being unpatentable over Olson in view of Matyas. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Essentially the same arguments presented above in regard to Roger and Matyas is also applicable to the combination of Olson and Matyas. As the Examiner recognizes, Olson also fails to teach to send a public key to a first of the two user computing devices and a first user computing device sending a public key to a second of the two user computing devices. In fact, Olson, like Roger, has the host client selectively admitting other clients on to

the application session and distributes a common set of application data to each newly admitted application client. Again, it is the host client that is retaining control over the distribution of the application data. Just as explained above in regard to Roger, this approach is fundamentally distinct from the sharing of the key with a first user computing device, where the first user computing device then has the ability to choose where to send the key, and not the host client who has now lost control over who to selectively admit into the application session. It is respectfully submitted, while Olson is a different reference than Roger, the same arguments presented above as to why Roger, in combination with Matyas, fails to arrive at applicants' claimed invention is also applicable to why the combination of Olson and Matyas fails to arrive at applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly Claims 1-3 are patentable over the applied art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections and objections to this application be reconsidered and withdrawn, and Claims 1-6, now in this application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTHUR R. HAIR, ET AL.

By _____
Ansel M. Schwartz, Esquire
Reg. No. 30,587
One Sterling Plaza
201 N. Craig Street, Suite 304
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 621-9222

Attorney for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 7/26/05

_____
Ansel M. Schwartz
Registration No. 30,587